(3)

CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1945.

No. 181

WELLS LAMONT CORPORATION, A CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

vs.

CHESTER BOWLES, PRICE ADMINISTRATOR, and JAMES G. ROGERS, ACTING ADMINISTRATOR.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS.

REPLY BRIEF OF PETITIONER.

ERNEST S. BALLARD,
JOHN R. WHITMAN,
120 So. La Salle Street,
Chicago 3, Illinois,

KARL D. LOOS,
Munsey Building,
Washington 4, D. C.,
Counsel for Petitioner.

THE BLAKEMORE-WARREN PRINTING COMPANY, 310 WEST JACKSON, CHICAGO

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1945.

No. 181.

WELLS LAMONT CORPORATION, A CORPORATION,
Petitioner,

vs.

CHESTER BOWLES, PRICE ADMINISTRATOR, and JAMES G. ROGERS, ACTING ADMINISTRATOR.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS.

REPLY BRIEF OF PETITIONER.

This Reply Brief will deal with but one question. That is the question of the uniformity, consistency and precision of operation of "in-line" pricing methods, as they have been employed by petitioner and other manufacturers in the glove industry for more than fifteen years. Upon its determination of that question alone rests the lower court's finding that the practice of "in-line" pricing is not a "practice" and that it was not "established" either as a practice or as a "means" or an "aid to distribution" in the glove industry, within the meaning of the provisions of Section 2(h) of the Act.

There is nothing in the statute indicating that a "practice" must be uniformly applied excepting, perhaps, as such lack of uniformity may lead to circumven-

tion or evasion. But in any event, if there is uniformity, then the lower court's decision—that "in-line" pricing was outside the purview of Section 2(h)—was incorrect. And if the selling prices for gloves within each class are, in fact, established with precision under "in-line" pricing methods, and the correctness of the amounts of those selling prices can be determined with precision by the Price Administrator for enforcement purposes, the decision of the lower court is wrong and should be reviewed.

The fact that the lower court erred in finding a lack of uniformity, of consistency and of precision in the operation of the practice can readily be demonstrated.

As support for its finding, the court relied in its final opinion upon the fact that price differences* between the selling prices of glove styles in the same class appearing "• • • in the December, 1941 price list varied from those in the March, 1942 list in many particulars." "Many were increased. Others were decreased." (R., 139.) Stated in another way, the court was referring to the fact that the amount of a price difference reflected in the December 1941 list between the selling prices of two glove styles in the same class may not, in every case, be the same as the amount of the price difference reflected in the March 1942 list between the selling prices of the same two styles.

---

*We use the term "price differences" instead of the term "price differentials" used by the Court. This is to avoid confusion with the differentials which are applicable to particular material and construction features of styles within each class of gloves. In making up a given price list, the application of the cent-amounts of the latter—that is, of the differentials representing features of construction—creates the former—that is, the price differences in selling prices quoted on the given price list.

As pointed out in the Petition for Certiorari, the lower court has misconceived the nature of the practice and the manner of its operation. Under the practice, the selling prices of all gloves on a single price list are fixed by the uniform application, in making up those prices, of the cent-amounts of differentials representing the various features with which the glove styles are constructed. The uniformity of application consists in the maintenance, throughout that one list, of a single differential for each of the features. Although the same cent-amount for each of those differentials is, in the main, carried forward in making up the selling prices for later price lists, yet, contrary to the Court's conception, the practice does not require it. Thus, the cent-amount of a differential is applied *horizontally* across the selling prices appearing on a single price list. The practice does not require the application of the same cent-amount of the differential *vertically* from one price list to the next.

The fact that the amount of a price difference between the selling prices of two styles in the same class appearing on one price list may be changed on a later list does not establish any lack of uniformity or precision in the application or operation of in-line pricing in making up the selling prices on *either* of those lists. Such changes, occurring between the issuance of one price list and another, are entirely consistent with "in-line" pricing methods.

We should like to clear up any possible doubt on this matter.

1. "In-line" standards operate horizontally across the selling prices on a single price list.

The "Chart" appearing at the conclusion of this Reply Brief lists all of the styles of gloves in the same class with Styles Nos. 3132 and 3130* which are described in the Catalog and priced in the December 1, 1941 published price

*Styles Nos. 3132 and 3130 were used in the Protest to show the operation of "in-line" pricing in some detail (R., 6-7).

list in evidence in this case (R., 38—Catalog pp. 16-21; R., 23-25).

At the top of the left hand column of the Chart, the characteristics common to all styles in the class are stated. These common characteristics are "Leather Palm and Flannel Back, with leather tipped fingers." The $3.50 amount stated immediately opposite this description in the adjoining column is the charge per dozen pair, reflected in the selling prices on the December, 1941 list, for the leather palm—made of the lowest-priced leather material (2nd grade shoulder split)—and the flannel back (with tipped fingers).

Under the heading "Differentials" in the left hand column is a brief description of each of the different material and construction features carried by the different styles in the class—that is, the kinds of leather material, the types of cuff and the additional features with which the various styles are constructed. Immediately opposite each of the features is the cent-amount, per dozen pair, of the differential which was applicable to that feature in making up the December 1941 list.*

* Descriptions of material and construction features are shown in the Catalog (R., 38—Catalog, pp. 16-20). The cent-amount of each differential can be computed from the difference in the December 1, 1941 selling prices of two styles with and without the feature, coupled in most instances with the application of other differentials determined previously on the below list. The style numbers used, the features involved and the resulting cent-amounts are:

Style Nos.	*Feature*	*Cent Amounts*
3130 and 3132 (Also, R., 7)	Knuckle Strap (split)	.25
3130 and 3132 (Also, R., 7)	Continuous Heel	.25
29 and 235	Full Leather First Finger	.25
3102 and 33	1st Grade Shoulder Split	.40
24 and 3296	Safety Cuff (wide), elastic back	1.10

(Continued at bottom of next page.)

At the top of each of the other columns on the Chart is the "Style Number" of a glove. The features employed in the construction of each style number are reflected in the column under that style number by the insertion of the cent-amount of the differentials applicable to the features which it carried. At the bottom of these columns, immediately under the heavy line, are the "Totals (per dozen pair)". Each total is reached by adding to the $3.50 amount, charged for the characteristics common to all styles in the class, the cent-amount of each differential applicable to the features carried by the style numbered at the top of the column. The total of the amount shown in the column of each style number is the precise amount of the selling price published for that style number in the December 1, 1941 price list, as shown on the line immediately below the "Totals".

The Chart demonstrates the uniformity and consistency with which "in-line" pricing is applied in making up the selling prices, for a given price list, of styles within a single class of gloves. It demonstrates that the cent-amount of a differential, representing a particular feature, is uniformly applied and maintained *horizontally* in making up

---

(Footnote continued from page 4.)

Style Nos.	*Feature*	*Cent Amounts*
29 and 24	Two-piece Waterproof Cufflex, elastic back	1.35
419 and 29	Waterproof Cufflex, elastic back	1.10
420 and 419	Safety Cuff (narrow), elastic back	.85
38 and 3102	Side Split	1.15
420 and 3130	Full Leather Thumb (split)	.25
239 and 39	Thumb Strap	.25
840P and 946P	Grain Leather Knuckle Strap	.50
327 and 420	¾ Leather Back	.75
790 and 24	E-Z Back Pattern	1.00
3398 and 3296	Fleece Lining and Roll Binding	1.35
840P and 24	Grain Leather (Buck tan) with Full Thumb	2.15
389P and 3130	Cream Grain Leather, Hob Nob	1.90
420 and 39	Lumber-Jack Pattern, knit-wrist	1.35
3102 and 3130	Knit-Wrist	.35
3296 and 420	Slip-on (no cuff), elastic back	.10

the selling prices, for a single price list, of all styles in the class which carry that feature.

Thus, the 25¢ differential applicable to the "knuckle-strap" feature carried by Style No. 3130 (6th column on Chart) was uniformly and consistently maintained in making up the selling prices on the December list for *each and every one* of the sixteen styles which carried that feature. Likewise, the 25¢ differential applicable to the "continuous-heel" feature carried by Style No. 3130 was uniformly and consistently maintained in making up the selling prices on the December list for all of the twenty-four styles which carried that feature.

The Chart demonstrates, too, that the *differences* between the selling prices of styles within the same class depend directly upon the features employed in their construction, and that those *price differences* are determined with absolute precision. Any given style may differ from another style in a single construction feature or in a combination of several features. But in making up a price list, the difference between the selling prices of the two styles is uniformly and precisely fixed through the application of the cent-amount of the single differential, or the cent-amounts of the several differentials representing those features.

The Chart shows, too, that, given the over-all selling price of a single style in the class and the cent-amounts applicable to the features carried by the styles in that class, the selling prices of all other styles in the class can be precisely and accurately determined. It answers respondent's claim, made in his brief (Page 11) that: "There is no way of knowing whether a particular style is a base glove until the manufacturer determines and announces that fact. * * * The subjective character of 'base gloves' merely provides sellers with another form of controlling differentials and selling prices." His statement is incorrect. For, as shown by the Chart, whatever style in the class is used as a "base"—whether Style 3130, 3132 or some other style—the application of "in-line"

pricing has led to the dollar and cent amount shown in the total at the bottom of the column under each style number; and that figure is the same as the December 1941 published selling price for the style.

It should, perhaps, again be noted here that the selling prices of the gloves had been made up and published in the December 1941 price list some five months before the General Maximum Price Regulation was even issued. The selling prices had been made up for the March 17, 1942, list more than two months before that Regulation was issued. Neither those selling prices nor the cent amounts of the applicable differentials could thereafter be changed. Petitioner could not thereafter and can not now, by "determining and announcing" that a particular style is a "base glove", exercise any control whatsoever over the amounts of the selling prices published for those gloves or the cent-amounts of the differentials representing the features employed in their construction; nor could he alter by a single cent the amounts of the price differences between the selling prices of those gloves which have resulted through the application of "in-line" pricing methods.

As has been stated, the Chart pictures the results of the application of "in-line" pricing in making up the selling prices of styles within a single class of gloves for a single price list. Petitioner's sworn statements establish the fact that "in-line" pricing was applied in making up the selling prices of styles within each separate class of gloves. The evidence and the binding admissions of respondent also establish the fact that it was applied by petitioner in making up its selling prices for a period of more than fifteen years to and including the March 17, 1942, published price list. (R., 5-8, 42; Complaint, R., 94). Accordingly, the Chart pictures the standards which have been applied by petitioner in making up the selling prices of styles within other classes of gloves on the December 1941 price list, as well as in making up the selling prices of gloves for other price lists published for a period

of more than fifteen years to and including the March 1942 price list.

2. *Variations in price differences from one price list to the next are entirely consistent with the uniform operation of the practice.*

As we have already stated, the fact that the difference between the selling prices of two glove styles in the same class on *one* price list may not be the same as the difference between the selling prices of the same styles on a *later* price list does not indicate any lack of uniformity or precision in applying "in-line" pricing methods in making up the selling prices for either list.

Such changes in price differences will occur, between the issuance of one price list and the next, where the cent-amount of a differential representing a particular feature, as applied in making up the selling prices for the first list, is not the same as the cent-amount of that differential as it is applied in making up the selling prices of the next list.

The correctness of this statement may be made clearer by specific examples of the effect of a change, from one price list to the next, in the cent-amount of a single differential upon price differences between styles in the same class. On Schedule A (R., 45), which is one of the schedules listing the 112 styles claimed by respondent to have been sold at over-ceiling prices, appear four style numbers which are constructed with "Grain Leather (Buck tan)" material. These are Style Nos. 840P, 849P, 928P and 946P (Schedule A, left hand column; R., 45). As shown by that Schedule the increase in price between the December 1941 and March 1942 lists was 75¢ in the case of each of those four styles. On the other hand, the price of Style No. 326, appearing in the right hand column opposite each of those four styles, was increased between the December and the March lists by only 50¢.

The breakdown of the selling prices, as published in the December list and as published in the later March list, for all five of those styles is as follows:

BREAKDOWN OF DECEMBER 1941 AND MARCH 1942 PUBLISHED SELLING PRICES OF FIVE GLOVE STYLES SHOWING THE RESULT OF A CHANGE IN THE CENT-AMOUNT OF A DIFFERENTIAL REPRESENTING A CONSTRUCTION FEATURE UPON PRICE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE SELLING PRICES OF GLOVES CONSTRUCTED WITH THAT FEATURE AND A GLOVE CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT THAT FEATURE.

Common Characteristics of Class:	Dec. 1, '41 Charge (per dz. pr.)	Mar. 17, '42 Charge (per dz. pr.)	Style No. 326* Dec.'41	Style No. 326* Mar.'42	Style No. 928P* Dec.'41	Style No. 928P* Mar.'42	Style No. 946P* Dec.'41	Style No. 946P* Mar.'42	Style No. 840P* Dec.'41	Style No. 840P* Mar.'42	Style No. 849P* Dec.'41	Style No. 849P* Mar.'42
Leather Palm and Flannel Back (tipped fingers):												
2nd Grade Shoulder Split Leather	$3.50	$4.00	$3.50	$4.00	$3.50	$4.00	$3.50	$4.00	$3.50	$4.00	$3.50	$4.00
DIFFERENTIALS	**Cent Amount Per Doz. Pair Dec. 1, 1941**	**Mar. 17, 1942**										
ALTERNATE LEATHERS:												
Side Split	$1.15	$1.15	$1.15	$1.15	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Grain Leather (Buck tan) with full thumb	**$2.15**	**$2.40‡**	—	—	$2.15	$2.40	$2.15	$2.40	$2.15	$2.40	$2.15	$2.40
ALTERNATE CUFFS:												
Safety Cuff (narrow band), elastic back	$ .85	$ .85	—	—	$ .85	$ .85	—	—	—	—	—	—
Safety Cuff (wide band), elastic back	$1.10	$1.10	—	—	—	—	—	—	$1.10	$1.10	—	—
GAUNTLET:												
Waterproof Cufflex, elastic back	$1.10	$1.10	$1.10	$1.10	—	—	$1.10	$1.10	—	—	—	—
Two-piece Waterproof Cufflex, elastic back	$1.35	$1.35	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	$1.35	$1.35
ADDITIONAL FEATURES:												
Grain Leather Knuckle-strap	$ .50	$ .50	—	—	—	—	—	—	$ .50	$ .50	$ .50	$ .50
Continuous Heel	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25
Full Leather Thumb (split)	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Full Leather First Finger	$ .25	$ .25	—	—	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25	$ .25
3/4 Leather Back	$ .75	$ .75	$ .75	$ .75	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
			$7.00	$7.50	$7.00	$7.75	$7.25	$8.00	$7.75	$8.50	$8.00	$8.75
Differences in price from Style No. 326:					**$ .00**	**$ .25**	**$ .25**	**$ .50**	**$ .75**	**$1.00**	**$1.00**	**$1.25**

*These five style numbers appear both on Schedule A (R., 45) and on the Chart at end of this Reply Brief.

‡This increase in differential was due to unusual increase in expense of grain leather as compared to side split leather construction (R., 43-Note(4)).

Thus, the 25¢ increase, between the issuance of the two price lists, in the cent-amount of the "Grain Leather (Buck tan)" differential from $2.15 to $2.40 had the results indicated in the bottom line of figures on the foregoing tabulation: The *price difference* between the selling price of No. 326 and each of the other four styles appearing in the December list varied from the price differences between the same styles, as reflected in the March list, by 25¢. These are the "variations" referred to by the lower court and relied upon by it in support of its finding that there was a lack of uniformity and precision in the operation of "in-line" pricing methods.

It is true that the cent-amounts of the differentials representing construction features have, during the history of "in-line" pricing in the glove industry, in the main remained the same. The fact that such changes occur with relative infrequency between the issuance of one price list and the next is demonstrated by the evidence in this case. There was an increase of approximately 10% in the over-all selling price of *every one* of petitioner's gloves between the December published list and the March published list. Yet, of the 167 styles priced on both lists, the evidence discloses that the *price differences* between the selling prices of 139 styles and of other styles in the same class remained exactly the same on the March list as they were on the December list. Thus, the differentials which were changed between the issuance of those price lists were so few that *price differences* were altered in the cases of only 28 of the 167 styles priced on both lists.

In any event, however, it has never been contended that once the cent-amount of a differential has been fixed, ther throughout the history of the glove industry, it may never change. Moreover, since the issuance by the lower court of the amendment to its original opinion, the respondent has not contended that, in order for "in-line" pricing to be a

practice within the protection of Section 2 (h), the cent-amounts of differentials making up the in-line structure must be "forever unvarying." As pointed out by respondent in his brief (Page 13): "The court's final opinion * * * makes no reference to 'unvarying' (R. 139-140)." But it is these same occasional changes from one price list to the next in the cent-amounts of differentials representing construction features, which have resulted in *variations* in *price differences* from one price list to the next. And it is upon these *variations* in *price differences* that the court still relies, in its final opinion. It is upon this ground alone that the court bases its finding that "in-line" pricing is not a "practice" and that it was not "established" either as a practice or as a "means" or "aid to distribution" in the glove industry.

It is upon this ground alone that any claim has been made that the establishment of ceiling prices according to "in-line" pricing methods could lead to circumvention or evasion of the Price Administrator's Regulation. But, as has been demonstrated, the standards for determining the correctness of selling prices for gloves are just as definite and certain under the "in-line" methods which petitioner is asking the court to protect as are those which the respondent seeks to employ.

Concluding Statement.

In this proceeding petitioner seeks protection of a practice which, as exemplified by the Chart at the end of this Reply Brief, is precise in its application and uniform in its operation. The respondent has been furnished, in this proceeding, with the standards which will enable him to determine with absolute precision the correctness of prices claimed to have been fixed according to those standards.

Petitioner included in its protest (Schedules A through

D; R., 41-51) information regarding the 112 styles claimed by respondent in his enforcement suit to have been sold by petitioner at over-ceiling prices. Respondent has already been satisfied, through that information furnished in this proceeding, that the selling prices of 87 of those styles were correctly priced according to "in-line" methods. He questions the prices of the other 25 of the 112 styles only because there are *variations* in *price differences,* from one list to the next, between the selling prices of those styles and other styles in their respective classes of gloves. But this is not the forum for the trial of his entire enforcement suit against petitioner through a determination here of the correctness, under "in-line" standards, of petitioner's prices on the other 25 styles. Given the standards which the respondent may employ, and employ with precision, this Court is not concerned with the evidence which may be presented to the enforcement court regarding the correctness of those prices.

The respondent can readily determine in his enforcement suit whether, as petitioner claimed in its protest, at least 17 of the 25 styles, involving such variations in price differences from one price list to the next, occurred as a result of and in conformity with the correct application of "in-line" standards. He can determine with absolute precision what are the correct "in-line" selling prices for the other 8 of those 25 styles, as well as the amounts of any overceiling charges which may have resulted through their sale.

The question for determination in this proceeding is whether "in-line" pricing is or is not a practice, or a "means" or an "aid to distribution" "established" in the glove industry; and if it is, whether the respondent still may compel a change in that practice in order to prevent "circumvention" or "evasion" of the provisions

of his regulation. Since the standards of "in-line" pricing, as contended for here, are uniform in operation, the practice of "in-line pricing" necessarily falls within the purview of Section 2(h) of the Act. Since those standards, as presented here, furnish the respondent with an exact and workable means of preventing circumvention and evasion, the practice does *not* fall within the exception provided for in that section. Once those standards have been recognized, the place to apply them is in the enforcement court.

Accordingly, it is respectfully urged that a writ of certiorari should issue to review the judgment and decision of the Emergency Court of Appeals.

Respectfully submitted,

ERNEST S. BALLARD,
JOHN R. WHITMAN,
120 So. La Salle Street,
Chicago 3, Illinois,
Counsel for Petitioner.

KARL D. LOOS,
Munsey Building,
Washington 4, D. C.

C I

Example Concerning I

BREAKDOWN OF SELLING PRICES
For Styles Within Single

Common Characteristics of the Class:
LEATHER PALM AND FLANNEL BACK,
with leather tipped fingers

LEATHER PALM AND FLANNEL BACK (tipped fingers)		Style No.	#33	#28
2nd Grade Shoulder Split Leather...	Am't Charged Dec. 1, 1941 (per dozen) $3.50		$3.50	$3.5

DIFFERENTIALS

Description of Material & Construction Features.	Cent Am't (per doz. pr.)			
ALTERNATE LEATHERS:				
2nd Grade Shoulder Split	$ .00	.00	—	
1st Grade Shoulder Split	.40	—	.4	
Side Split	1.15	—	—	
Cream Grain Leather, Hob Nob	1.90	—	—	
Grain Leather (Buck tan), with full thumb	2.15	—	—	
ALTERNATE CUFFS:				
Slip-on (no cuff), elastic back	.10	—	—	
Knit-wrist	.35	.35	.3	
Safety Cuff (narrow band), elastic back	.85	—	—	
Safety Cuff (wide band), elastic back	1.10	—	—	
Gauntlet Styles:				
Waterproof Cufflex, elastic back	1.10	—	—	
Two-piece Waterproof Cufflex, elastic back	1.35	—	—	
ADDITIONAL FEATURES:				
Knuckle Strap (split)	.25	—	—	
Grain Leather Knuckle Strap	.50	—	—	
Continuous Heel	.25	—	—	
Thumb Strap	.25	—	—	
Full Leather Thumb (split)	.25	—	—	
Full Leather First Finger	.25	—	—	
¾ Leather Back	.75	—	—	
Lumber-Jack Pattern, knit wrist	1.35	—	—	
E-Z Back Pattern	1.00	—	—	
Fleece Lining and Roll Binding	1.35	—	—	
TOTALS (per dozen pair)		$3.85	$4.25	
Dec. 1, 1941 Published Selling Prices (per dozen pair) (Record, pp. 23-25)		$3.85	$4.25	
Catalog Page (Record, p. 38)		19	18	

Style No.	#33	#285	#3102	#3132	#3162	#3130	#38	#3296	#3160	#388P	#39
	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50
	.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	—	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	—	—	.40	—	—
	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.15	1.15	—	—	1.15
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.90	—
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	.10	—	—	—
	.35	.35	.35	—	—	—	.35	—	—	.35	—
	—	—	—	.85	—	.85	—	—	—	—	—
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	—	—	—	—	1.10	—	—	—	1.10	—	—
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	—	—	—	—	—	.25	—	—	.25	—	—
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	—	—	—	—	—	.25	—	—	.25	—	.25
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		—	—
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	.25	—	—	—
	—	—	—	—	—	—	.25	.25	—	—	—
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.35
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	$3.85	$4.25	$4.25	$4.75	$5.00	$5.25	$5.25	$5.25	$5.50	$5.75	$6.25
	$3.85	$4.25	$4.25	$4.75	$5.00	$5.25	$5.25	$5.25	$5.50	$5.75	$6.25
	19	18	16	16	16	16	16	18	16	20	17

HART

December 1, 1941 Published Prices

S FIXED UNDER "IN-LINE" PRICING METHODS
e Class of Leather Palm Glove Group

#389P	#420	#3492	#236	#239	#390P	#419	#944P	#3398	#24	#224	#235
$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	—	1.15	—	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15
1.90	—	—	—	—	1.90	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2.15	—	—	—	—
—	—	.10	—	—	—	—	—	.10	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	.35	—	—	—	—
.85	.85	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	1.10	—	—	—	—	—	1.10	1.10	—
—	—	—	—	—	1.10	1.10	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.35
—	.25	.25	.25	—	—	.25	—	.25	.25	.25	.25
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	.25	—	.25	.25	—	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25
—	—	—	—	.25	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	.25	.25	.25	—	—	.25	—	—	.25	.25	.25
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	.25	—	.25	.25	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	1.35	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	1.00	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.35	—	—	—
$6.25	$6.25	$6.25	$6.50	$6.50	$6.50	$6.50	$6.50	$6.60	$6.75	$6.75	$6.75
$6.25	$6.25	$6.25	$6.50	$6.50	$6.50	$6.50	$6.50	$6.60	$6.75	$6.75	$6.75
20	17	18	17	17	20	17	20	18	17	17	17

ublished Prices

'IN-LINE" PRICING METHODS
lm Glove Group

236	#239	#390P	#419	#944P	#3398	#24	#224	#235	#327	#29	#229	#3
3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	-
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	-
1.15	1.15	—	1.15	—	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.15	1.
—	—	1.90	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	-
—	—	—	—	2.15	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	-
—	—	—	—	—	.10	—	—	—	—	—	—	-
—	—	—	—	.35	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	-
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	.85	—	—	-
.10	—	—	—	—	—	1.10	1.10	—	—	—	—	-
—	—	1.10	1.10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.35	—	1.35	1.35	-
.25	—	—	.25	—	.25	.25	.25	.25	—	.25	.25	-
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	-
.25	.25	—	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.
—	.25	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	-
.25	—	—	.25	—	—	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.
—	—	—	—	.25	—	.25	.25	—	.75	—	—	-
—	1.35	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	-
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	-
—	—	—	—	—	1.35	—	—	—	—	—	—	-
50	$6.50	$6.50	$6.50	$6.50	$6.60	$6.75	$6.75	$6.75	$6.75	$7.00	$7.00	$7.0
50	$6.50	$6.50	$6.50	$6.50	$6.60	$6.75	$6.75	$6.75	$6.75	$7.00	$7.00	$7.0
17	17	20	17	20	18	17	17	17	17	17	17	

#29	#229	#326	#928P	#946P	#790	#3432	#840P	#789	#3462	#849P
3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50	$3.50
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1.15	1.15	1.15	—	—	1.15	1.15	—	1.15	1.15	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	2.15	2.15	—	—	2.15	—	—	2.15
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	.85	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	1.10	1.10	1.10	—	—	—
—	—	1.10	—	1.10	—	—	—	—	—	—
1.35	1.35	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.35	1.35	1.35
.25	.25	—	—	—	.25	.25	—	.25	.25	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	.50	—	—	.50
.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25	.25
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
.25	.25	.25	—	—	.25	.25	—	.25	.25	—
.25	.25	—	.25	.25	—	—	.25	—	—	.25
—	—	.75	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	1.00	1.00	—	1.00	1.00	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
7.00	$7.00	$7.00	$7.00	$7.25	$7.50	$7.50	$7.75	$7.75	$7.75	$8.00
7.00	$7.00	$7.00	$7.00	$7.25	$7.50	$7.50	$7.75	$7.75	$7.75	$8.00
17	17	17	20	21	18	19	20	18	19	20